

Amend Claim 3 as follows:

3. (Amended) A rotor for a rotating electrical machine as set forth in claim 2, wherein the hub portion is integral with the cylindrical and interconnecting disk shaped portions.

Amend Claim 4 as follows:

4. (Amended) A rotor for a rotating electrical machine as set forth in claim 1, wherein the interconnecting disk shaped portion extends radially inwardly from the cylindrical portion at one side thereof.

Amend Claim 5 as follows:

5. (Amended) A rotor for a rotating electrical machine as set forth in claim 4, further including a plurality ribs equal in number to the openings extending axially outwardly from said interconnecting disk shaped portion and juxtaposed to one side of said openings.

Amend Claim 6 as follows:

6. (Amended) A rotor for a rotating electrical machine as set forth in claim 5, wherein the ribs extend radially beyond the openings.

Amend Claim 7 as follows:

7. (Amended) A rotor for a rotating electrical machine as set forth in claim 1, wherein the cooling openings occupy the major portion of the interconnecting disk shaped portion so that the remaining areas of said interconnecting disk shaped portion comprise spokes.

Cancel Claims 9 and 10 without prejudice.

Add the following new claim:

11. A rotor for a rotating electrical machine as set forth in claim 6, wherein the ribs are formed on the side of the interconnecting disk shaped portion opposite to the inclined edges of the openings.

#### REMARKS

The claims have been reviewed and have been amended rather extensively not only to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 but also to further emphasize the distinctions between Applicant's invention and the French publication cited by the Examiner. Applicant's attorney has obtained a translation of that document and it is enclosed herewith for the Examiner's assistance.

Turning to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Examiner has rejected Claims 4 through 8 and then discusses language which allegedly is in Claim 2. However, the language that the Examiner has objected to was in Claim 3 and thus, it is believed that the rejection was intended to encompass Claims 3 through 8. In any event, the claim has been amended so as to avoid the Examiner's objection.